

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

HUMBOLDT BAYKEEPER,
Plaintiff,

v.

ROYAL GOLD, LLC,
Defendant.

Case No. [16-cv-06285-RS](#)

**ORDER GRANTING EXTENSION OF
TIME**

Defendant Royal Gold requests an extension of time to file its response to Plaintiff Humbolt Baykeeper's complaint. Royal Gold notes that Humbolt Baykeeper has filed a relevant administrative challenge, which is set to be heard by the Humbolt County Board of Supervisors ("Board of Supervisors") on December 6, 2016. Royal Gold contends that the Board of Supervisors is expected to vote on that challenge either at the hearing or shortly thereafter. Humbolt Baykeeper opposes the extension citing concerns about its ability to begin discovery during the "rainy season." Good cause appearing, Royal Gold shall have until January 6, 2017 to answer Humbolt Baykeeper's complaint. In the future, the parties are encouraged to confer and reach agreement about scheduling issues without expending judicial resources.¹

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: December 5, 2016



RICHARD SEEBORG
United States District Judge

¹ The parties are also encouraged to review the local rules; Royal Gold's request was improperly styled as an *ex parte* motion.